



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,319	01/26/2004	Vikram Madan	306171.01/MFCP.153380	1220
45809 7590 06/24/2010 SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P. (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT 2555 GRAND BOULEVARD KANSAS CITY, MO 64108-2613				
EXAMINER				
LEWIS, ALICIA M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2164				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
06/24/2010		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/766,319

Applicant(s)

MADAN ET AL.

Examiner

ALICIA M. LEWIS

Art Unit

2164

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 March 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 20-22, 24-28 and 30-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 20-22, 24-28 and 30-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Final office action is responsive to communication filed March 3, 2010.

Claims 10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 20-22, 24-28, 30 and 31 are currently amended, and claims 32-37 have been added. Therefore claims 10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 20-22, 24-28 and 30-37 remain pending in this application.

Claim Objections

1. Claim 27 is objected to because of the following informalities:
2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for the terms "the display" in line 5 of the claim and "the boundaries" in line 6 of the claim.
3. Applicant has deleted the limitations "automatically determining that the content displayed within the on screen region includes the textual data" and "automatically determining that the displayed content of the on screen region includes underlying data...of the selected on screen region." However, the claim includes limitations that occur in response to the deleted determination steps, i.e. including "in response to automatically determining that the content displayed within the on screen region includes the textual data" and in response to "automatically determining that the displayed content of the on screen region includes underlying data...of the selected on screen region."
4. Appropriate correction is required.

5. Claim 28 is objected to because of the following informalities: It is unclear as to what input the claim limitation "interpreting the input" is referring.
6. The added limitation "determining if the bounded character or word lies within the selected on-screen region" is unclear and contradicts the previous limitation "a bounded character or word from textual data determined to be included in the on-screen region." It is already determined that the bounded character or word is included in the on-screen region, thus the determining step is ambiguous.
7. Appropriate correction is required.
8. Claim 36 is objected to because of the following informalities: The limitation "any subsequent sets of textual characters reside outside the path drawn by the user" is unclear. Any textual characters not in the selected region when the region is selected are inherently outside the path drawn. The Examiner suggests clarifying the limitation. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 10, 20-22, 30, 36 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) (*current application filing date 1/26/2004*) as being unpatentable over Denoue et al. (US

Art Unit: 2164

2004/0119762 A1, *filing date 12/24/2002*) ('Denoue') in view of Dawe et al. (US 7,042,594 B1, *filing date 3/7/2000*) ('Dawe'), further in view of Woolf et al. (WO 01/42980 A1) ('Woolf'), and further in view of Saund et al. (US 2003/0182630 A1) ('Saund').

With respect to claim 10, Denoue teaches:

setting a mode of operation to a content capture mode for interpreting user input for the purpose of selecting an on-screen region of a display (paragraphs 56, 75-78 and 86), and receiving a path drawn by a user (paragraphs 54 and 86), the path defining boundaries of the selected region of the display (paragraph 59), wherein pixels comprising one or more graphical elements being displayed in the selected on-screen region (Figure 6, paragraph 67);

capturing the pixels displayed within the selected on-screen region (paragraphs 67 and 86-87), and storing the captured pixels (paragraph 89); and

obtaining context information for the one or more graphical elements by automatically applying text recognition (paragraph 79) to an annotation (*i.e. freeform inks 532, 534, 536 and freeform notes*) (paragraphs 57 and 75) (*OCR may be applied to captured content and captured content may include freeform inks, as seen in figs. 2-5*),

wherein context information is stored in association with the captured data (paragraphs 75-76).

Denoue does not explicitly teach storing captured data in an image file; storing the results of text recognition as context information via the computer system; or automatically storing context information in association with the image file.

Dawe teaches a system and method for saving handwriting as an annotation in a scanned document (see abstract), in which he teaches:

capturing image pixels and storing captured image pixels in an image file (col. 3 lines 60-63, col. 7 line 61- col. 8 line 4);

applying text recognition to annotations and storing the results of text recognition as context information via the computer system (col. 5 lines 52-60, col. 7 lines 6-20 and 61-65); and

automatically storing context information in association with the image file (col. 7 lines 57-65).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Denoue by the teaching of Dawe because storing captured data in an image file; storing the results of text recognition as context information; or automatically storing context information in association with the image file would enable handwriting to be saved as an annotation, and thus reduce clutter in a document presented to a user, while maintaining the information conveyed by the handwriting for presentation to the user if desired (Dawe, abstract).

Further regarding claim 10, Denoue in view of Dawe does not teach receiving a user command to set the mode of operation to an annotation mode for interpreting the user input for the purpose of annotating the one or more graphical elements and, in response to the user command, switching the mode of operation to the annotation mode and receiving an annotation drawn by the user on the display.

Woolf teaches a system and method for annotating an electronic document independently of its content (see abstract), in which he teaches receiving a user

command to set the mode of operation to an annotation mode for interpreting the user input for the purpose of annotating the one or more graphical elements (Figure 4 and page 7 lines 5-12), and in response to the user command, switching the mode of operation to the annotation mode and receiving an annotation drawn by the user on the display (Figures 4 and 5, page 7 lines 24-26), wherein the received annotation is implemented using a plurality of tools via a toolbar, the toolbar appearing after selecting a button (Figure 4, page 7 lines 5-14).

Woolf teaches a user interface on a screen that has a toolbar at the bottom of the screen (Figure 4). Further, the annotation menu 402 may be considered a toolbar because it includes interactive buttons that may be clicked to activate a tool (i.e. ink mode, selection mode, highlight mode or erase mode). The annotation menu appears in response to tapping or selecting a button.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Denoue by the teaching of Woolf because receiving a user command to set the mode of operation to an annotation mode for interpreting the user input for the purpose of annotating the one or more graphical elements and, in response to the user command, switching the mode of operation to the annotation mode and receiving an annotation drawn by the user on the display would enable users the ability to annotate pages of a document without changing the contents of the document (Woolf, page 2 lines 14-15).

Further regarding claim 10, Denoue in view of Dawe and Woolf fails to explicitly teach the toolbar (or menu) appearing after selecting an on screen region.

Saund teaches a method for gestural interpretation in a system for selecting and arranging visible material in document images (see abstract), in which he teaches a toolbar appearing after selecting an on-screen region (paragraphs 29-30).

Saund teaches that a user draws a path that encloses or partially encloses at least one object. In response to this gesture, a pop-up menu choose box 320 appears. The pop-up menu may be considered a toolbar because the select button is an interactive button that may be clicked to activate a selection tool. Further, Saund teaches that tools are usually provided by menus (paragraph 5).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Denoue by the teaching of Saund to enable users the ability to enter, select or modify data without pre-selecting an input mode (Saund, abstract).

With respect to claim 20, Denoue in view Dawe, Woolf and Saund teaches wherein the context information is stored in such a manner as to be accessible to the user for performing at least one of the following:

searching for said context information;

displaying the context information simultaneously with the captured image pixels (Denoue, paragraphs 75-76; Dawe, col.8 lines 1-16), and

navigating a network to a source of the captured image pixels.

With respect to claim 21, Denoue in view Dawe, Woolf and Saund teaches wherein the one or more graphical elements represent a first set of one or more textual characters, and the method further comprising: obtaining additional context information by extracting the first set of one or more textual characters, extracting a second set of textual characters displayed in proximity with the first set, and storing the first and second sets of textual characters as the additional context information (Dawe, col. 7 lines 6-20 and lines 61-65; Denoue, paragraph 72), the additional context information being automatically stored in association with the image file (Dawe, col. 7 lines 57-65).

With respect to claim 22, Denoue in view Dawe, Woolf and Saund teaches wherein the selected on-screen region is part of a displayed textual region, and the graphical elements comprise a first set of one or more textual characters displayed in the textual region, the method further comprising: obtaining additional context information based on a second set of one or more textual characters displayed in the textual region (Dawe, Fig. 4, col. 7 lines 6-20 and lines 61-65; Denoue, paragraph 72), the additional context information being automatically stored in association with the image file (Dawe, col. 7 lines 57-65) (*The words "job" or "awareness" may be considered the second set of textual characters*).

With respect to claim 30, Denoue in view Dawe, Woolf and Saund teaches wherein the annotation is stored as originally drawn as additional context information in association with the image file (Dawe, col. 7 lines 9-11, 18-20 and 57-65).

With respect to claim 36, Denoue in view Dawe, Woolf and Saund teaches determining that the second sets of textual characters reside within the path drawn by the user and any subsequent sets of textual characters reside outside the path drawn by the user (Dawe, col. 7 lines 11-16). *Dawe teaches that it is determined that the word "job" resides within the path drawn. It is inherent that any subsequent characters (i.e. characters that are not in the region when the region is selected) will be outside the path drawn.*

With respect to claim 37, Denoue in view Dawe, Woolf and Saund teaches wherein the received annotation is implemented using a plurality of tools via a toolbar (Woolf, Figure 4, page 7 lines 5-14), the toolbar appearing after a stylus has been lifted off the display (Saund, paragraphs 29-30). *Saund teaches that the pop-up menu (i.e. toolbar) appear after a path has been drawn, meaning the stylus has been lifted.*

11. Claim 11, 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denoue et al. (US 2004/0119762 A1, *filing date 12/24/2002*) ('Denoue') in view of Dawe et al. (US 7,042,594 B1, *filing date 3/7/2000*) ('Dawe'), Woolf et al. (WO 01/42980 A1) ('Woolf'), and Saund et al. (US 2003/0182630 A1) ('Saund'), as applied to

claims 10, 20-22, 30, 36 and 37 above, and further in view of Oppermann et al. (US 6,334,157 B1, *filing date 3/11/1997*) ('Oppermann').

With respect to claim 11, Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf and Saund teaches claim 10, including a selected on-screen region and automatically storing context information in association with the image file (Dawe, col. 7 lines 57-65).

Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf and Saund does not teach determining a window associated with the selected on-screen region; retrieving an application interface having a uniform resource identifier (URI) property from the determined window or parent window of the determined window; or obtaining the URI property as additional context information.

Oppermann teaches programmatically providing direct access to user interface elements of an application program (see abstract), in which he teaches:

selecting user interface elements, such as text (col. 8 lines 43 and 49-51) and determining a window associated with the selected elements (col. 26 lines 37-40);

retrieving an application interface having a uniform resource identifier (URI) property from the determined window or parent window of the determined window (col. 25 lines 59-62, col. 28 lines 33-39); and

obtaining the URI property as additional context information (col. 11 lines 1-9, 55-60, col. 12 lines 55-60, col. 13 lines 51-60).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Denoue by the teaching of Oppermann

because determining a window, retrieving an application interface having a uniform resource identifier (URI) property from the determined window or parent window of the determined window would enable accessibility aids the ability to access and manipulate user interface elements of any application program without having prior knowledge of the application program or its interface (Oppermann, column 4 lines 27-30).

With respect to claim 25, Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf, Saund and Oppermann teaches wherein the selected on-screen region includes at least a portion of a displayed web page or document (Dawe, Figure 4, col. 4 lines 38-42), and the method further comprises: using an application programming interface (API) to query an application for additional context information (Oppermann, column 7 lines 36-38), the additional context information being automatically stored in association with the image file (Dawe, col. 7 lines 57-65), the queried application causing the one or more graphical elements to be displayed (Oppermann, column 7 lines 36-45; Denoue, paragraphs 86-87).

With respect to claim 26, Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf, Saund and Oppermann teaches further comprising obtaining a uniform resource identifier (URI) of the web page or document as the context information (Oppermann, col. 11 lines 1-9, 55-60, col. 12 lines 55-60, col. 13 lines 51-60), the URI being obtained as a result of the query using the API (Oppermann, column 7 lines 36-38).

12. Claims 15, 18, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denoue et al. (US 2004/0119762 A1, *filing date 12/24/2002*) ('Denoue') in view of Dawe et al. (US 7,042,594 B1, *filing date 3/7/2000*) ('Dawe'), Woolf et al. (WO 01/42980 A1) ('Woolf'), and Saund et al. (US 2003/0182630 A1) ('Saund'), as applied to claims 10, 20-22, 30, 36 and 37 above, and further in view of Browne et al. (US 2004/0135815 A1, *filing date 12/15/2003*) ('Browne').

With respect to claim 15, Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf and Saund teaches claim 10.

Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf and Saund does not teach creating and storing a linking structure as the association between the image file and the context information.

Browne teaches a method and apparatus for image metadata entry (see abstract), in which he teaches creating and storing a linking structure as the association between the image file and the context information (Figure 12, paragraph 136).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Denoue by the teaching of Browne because teach creating and storing a linking structure as the association between the image file and the context information would enable an easy and efficient method of classifying and storing digital images (Browne, paragraph 14).

With respect to claim 18, Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf, Saund and Browne teaches wherein the linking structure includes at least one pointer pointing to the stored image file or the stored content information (Browne, paragraph 136).

With respect to claim 32, Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf, Saund and Browne teaches a link to the one or more graphical elements of the selected on-screen region, the link comprising one of an implicit link hidden behind the one or more graphical elements and an explicit link shown in conjunction with the one or more graphical elements (Browne, paragraph 136). (*Browne teaches metadata-image associations, in which pointers are stored between images and metadata*).

With respect to claim 33, Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf, Saund and Browne teaches a separate linking table or database entry utilizing one or more pointers to the one or more graphical elements (Browne, paragraph 136). (*Browne teaches metadata-image associations, in which pointers are stored between images and metadata*).

13. Claims 32 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denoue et al. (US 2004/0119762 A1, *filing date 12/24/2002*) ('Denoue') in view of Dawe et al. (US 7,042,594 B1, *filing date 3/7/2000*) ('Dawe'), Woolf et al. (WO 01/42980 A1) ('Woolf'), and Saund et al. (US 2003/0182630 A1) ('Saund'), as applied to claims 10, 20-22, 30, 36 and 37 above, and further in view of Hertzfeld et al. (US 2002/0076109 A1, *filing date 1/25/1999*) ('Hertzfeld').

With respect to claim 32, Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf and Saund teaches claim 10.

Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf and Saund does not teach a link to the one or more graphical elements of the selected on-screen region, the link comprising one of an implicit link hidden behind the one or more graphical elements and an explicit link shown in conjunction with the one or more graphical elements.

Hertzfeld teaches a method and apparatus for context sensitive text recognition (see abstract), in which he teaches a link to the one or more graphical elements of the selected on-screen region, the link comprising one of an implicit link hidden behind the one or more graphical elements and an explicit link shown in conjunction with the one or more graphical elements (elements 608 and 616 in Fig. 6, paragraph 38).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Denoue by the teaching of Hertzfeld to enable recognition of predefined types of text and predefined actions to be performed based on the types of text (Hertzfeld, abstract).

With respect to claim 35, Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf, Saund and Hertzfeld teaches wherein the one or more graphical elements comprise underlying data, underlying objects, and underlying associations with remote content (Hertzfeld, Fig. 6, paragraph 38).

14. Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denoue et al. (US 2004/0119762 A1, *filing date 12/24/2002*) ("Denoue") in view of Dawe et al. (US 7,042,594 B1, *filing date 3/7/2000*) ("Dawe"), Woolf et al. (WO 01/42980 A1) ("Woolf"), and Saund et al. (US 2003/0182630 A1) ("Saund"), as applied to claims 10, 20-22, 30, 36 and 37 above, and further in view of Chan (US 2006/0100849 A1).

With respect to claim 34, Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf and Saund teaches claim 10.

Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf and Saund does not teach displaying the obtained context information to the user as one of displaying a property in a window and hovering over the one or more graphical elements.

Chan teaches a system for providing a user bilingual annotations (see abstract), in which he teaches displaying the obtained context information to the user as one of displaying a property in a window and hovering over the one or more graphical elements (paragraphs 11, 49 and 66) (*Chan teaches that translated versions of text objects may be displayed when the pointer is adjacent to or overlaid by a user's pointer*).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Denoue by the teaching of Chan to enable an annotation tool providing annotations in multiple languages, thereby making documents accessible to more users (Chan, abstract, paragraph 14).

15. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denoue et al. (US 2004/0119762 A1, *filing date 12/24/2002*) ('Denoue') in view of Dawe et al (US 7,042,594 B1, *filing date 3/7/2000*) ('Dawe'), Woolf et al. (WO 01/42980 A1) ('Woolf'), Saund et al. (US 2003/0182630 A1) ('Saund'), and Browne et al. (US 2004/0135815 A1, *filing date 12/15/2003*) ('Browne'), as applied to claims 15 and 18 above, and further in view of Newman (US 2003/0101156 A1, *filing date 11/26/2001*).

With respect to claim 17, Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf, Saund and Browne teaches claim 15.

Denoue in view of Dawe, Woolf, Saund and Browne does not teach wherein the linking structure is incorporated in a file separate from the stored image file and the stored content information.

Newman teaches database systems and methods (see abstract), in which he teaches wherein the linking structure is incorporated in a file separate from the stored image file and the stored content information (paragraph 16).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Denoue by the teaching of Newman because wherein the linking structure is incorporated in a file separate from the stored image file and the stored content information would enable additional information about image files, such as the origination device, person who created the file, and data/time the file was created, to be transmitted and stored along with the image files (Newman, paragraph 16).

16. Claims 24 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Denoue et al. (US 2004/0119762 A1, *filing date 12/24/2002*) ('Denoue') in view of Dawe et al (US 7,042,594 B1, *filing date 3/7/2000*) ('Dawe'), and further in view of Hertzfeld et al. (US 2002/0076109 A1, *filing date 1/25/1999*) ('Hertzfeld') and Chan (US 2006/0100849 A1).

With respect to claim 27, Denoue teaches:

receiving a path drawn on the display by a user via an input device (paragraphs 54 and 86), the drawn path defining the boundaries of a selected on-screen region of the display, the selected on-screen region comprising a plurality of pixels (Figure 6, paragraphs 59 and 67);

capturing the plurality of pixels of the on-screen region (paragraphs 67 and 86-87); and

storing the captured image pixels (paragraph 89);

extracting a character or word from textual data as context information via the computer system (paragraph 79); and

storing the extracted context information in association with the captured data (paragraphs 75-76).

Denoue does not teach: storing captured data in an image file; in response to automatically determining that the displayed content of the on-screen region includes

the textual data, automatically extracting a character or word from the textual data as context information via the computer system; or storing the extracted context information and additional context information in association with the image file via the data storage subsystem, such that the context information is accessible when viewing the image file.

Dawe teaches a system and method for saving handwriting as an annotation in a scanned document (see abstract), in which he teaches:

capturing image pixels and storing captured image pixels in an image file (col. 3 lines 60-63, col. 7 line 61- col. 8 line 4);

in response to automatically determining that the displayed content of the on-screen region includes the textual data, automatically extracting a character or word from the textual data as context information via the computer system (col. 7 lines 6-8 and 15-20); and

storing the extracted context information and additional context information in association with the image file via the data storage subsystem, such that the context information is accessible when viewing the image file (col. 7 lines 57-60, col. 8 lines 1-16).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Denoue by the teaching of Dawe to enable handwriting to be saved as an annotation, and thus reduce clutter in a document

presented to a user, while maintaining the information conveyed by the handwriting for presentation to the user if desired (Dawe, abstract).

Further regarding claim 27, Denoue in view of Dawe does not teach a displayed content of the selected on-screen region includes both textual data and underlying data comprising at least one of: an executable object, a file, or a link to remote content; or in response to determining that the displayed content of the on-screen region includes underlying data, automatically extracting a property of the underlying data as additional context information via the computer system, the property comprising at least one of: a file name, a file identifier, a uniform resource locator (URL), a uniform resource identifier (URI), a folder name, or meta-data.

Hertzfeld teaches a method and apparatus for context sensitive text recognition (see abstract), in which he teaches:

a displayed content of the selected on-screen region includes both textual data and underlying data comprising at least one of: an executable object, a file, or a link to remote content (Hertzfeld, steps 602 and 608 in Figure 6, paragraph 38); and

in response to determining that the displayed content of the on-screen region includes underlying data, automatically extracting a property of the underlying data as additional context information via the computer system, the property comprising at least one of: a file name, a file identifier, a uniform resource locator (URL), a uniform resource identifier (URI), a folder name, or meta-data (step 616 in Figure 6, paragraph 38).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Denoue by the teaching of Hertzfeld because the content of the selected on-screen region includes both textual data and underlying data comprising at least one of: an executable object, a file, or a link to remote content; and in response to determining that the displayed content of the on-screen region includes underlying data, automatically extracting a property of the underlying data as additional context information, the property comprising at least one of: a file name, a file identifier, a uniform resource locator (URL), a uniform resource identifier (URI), a folder name, and meta-data would enable recognition of predefined types of text and predefined actions to be performed based on the types of text (Hertzfeld, abstract).

Further regarding claim 27, Denoue in view of Dawe and Hertzfeld does not teach extracting complete sentences based upon punctuation.

Chan teaches a system and method for providing bilingual annotations (see abstract), in which he teaches extracting complete sentences based upon punctuation (paragraph 77).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Denoue by the teaching of Chan to enable an annotation tool providing annotations in multiple languages, thereby making documents accessible to more users (Chan, abstract, paragraph 14).

With respect to claim 24, Denoue in view of Dawe, Hertzfeld and Chan teaches:
digitizing movements of a stylus across the display in order to receive the
annotation (Denoue, paragraphs 55, 57 and 75); and
obtaining additional context information based on the received annotation
(Denoue, paragraph 79), the additional context information being automatically stored in
association with the image file (Dawe, col. 7 lines 57-65).

17. Claims 28 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable
over Dawe et. al (US 7,042,594 B1, *filing date 3/7/2000*) ('Dawe') in view of Denoue et
al. (US 2004/0119762 A1, *filing date 12/24/2002*) ('Denoue'), in view of Woolf et al. (WO
01/42980 A1) ('Woolf'), and further in view of Hertzfeld et al. (US 2002/0076109 A1,
filing date 1/25/1999) ('Hertzfeld').

With respect to claim 28, Dawe teaches:
receiving a path drawn on the display by the input device (col. 5 lines 28-30; col.
6 lines 48-50), the drawn path defining the boundaries of a selected on-screen region
of the display, the selected on-screen region comprising a plurality of pixels (col. 6
lines 42-51);
capturing the plurality of pixels of the on-screen region (col. 3 lines 60-63, col. 7
lines 40-42 and lines 61-65, col. 8 lines 1-3);
storing the captured pixels as an image file via the data storage subsystem (col.
3 lines 60-63, col. 7 lines 40-42 and lines 61-65, col. 8 lines 1-3), wherein the content

displayed within the on-screen region includes at least one of: textual data, an executable object, a file, or a link to remote content (col. 4 lines 46-59, col. 7 lines 38-40);

automatically determining via the computer system that the content displayed within the on-screen region includes at least one of textual data and other underlying data comprising at least one of an executable object, a file, and a link to remote content (col. 6 lines 52-53, col. 7 lines 11-20);

automatically extracting as additional context information:

a bounded character or word from the textual data determined to be included in the on-screen region (col. 7 lines 6-20 and 57-65, col. 8 lines 19-26), and determining if the bounded character or word lies within the selected region (col. 7 lines 11-16); and

storing the context information and the additional context information in association with the image file via the data storage subsystem, such that the context information is accessible when viewing the image file (col. 7 lines 57-60, col. 8 lines 1-16).

Dawe does not teach setting a mode of operation to a content capture mode for interpreting input from an input device for the purpose of selecting an on-screen region of a display.

Denoue teaches systems and methods for freeform pasting (see abstract), in which he teaches setting a mode of operation to a content capture mode for

interpreting input from an input device for the purpose of selecting an on-screen region of a display (paragraphs 56, 75-78 and 86).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Dawe by the teaching of Denoue because setting a mode of operation to a content capture mode for interpreting input for the purpose of selecting an on-screen region of a display would enable the user or other users to ability to reselect content in a simplified manner (Denoue, abstract, paragraph 89).

Further regarding claim 28, Dawe in view of Denoue does not teach switching the mode of operation to an annotation mode and receiving an annotation drawn on the display via the input device; or interpreting the input and annotating the content displayed within the on-screen region.

Woolf teaches a system and method for annotating an electronic document (see abstract), in which he teaches:

switching the mode of operation to the annotation mode and receiving an annotation drawn on the display via the input device (Figs. 4 and 5, page 7 lines 5-12 and lines 24-26 and); and

interpreting the input and annotating the content displayed within the on-screen region (Fig. 5, page 5 lines 21-23, page 7 lines 24-26, page 8 lines 27-30).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Dawe by the teaching of Woolf

because receiving an annotation drawn on the display would enable users the ability to annotate pages of a document without changing the contents of the document (Woolf, page 2 lines 14-15).

Further regarding claim 28, Dawe in view of Denoue and Woolf does not teach extracting as additional context information, a property of underlying data determined to be included in the on-screen region, the property comprising at least one of: a file name, a file identifier, a uniform resource locator (URL), a uniform resource identifier (URI), a folder name, or meta-data.

Hertzfeld teaches a method and apparatus for context sensitive text recognition (see abstract), in which he teaches automatically extracting as additional context information, a property of the underlying data determined to be included in the on-screen region, the property comprising at least one of: a file name, a file identifier, a uniform resource locator (URL), a uniform resource identifier (URI), a folder name, or meta-data (step 616 in Figure 6, paragraph 38).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Dawe by the teaching of Hertzfeld to enable recognition of predefined types of text and predefined actions to be performed based on the types of text (Hertzfeld, abstract).

With respect to claim 31, Dawe in view of Denoue, Woolf and Hertzfeld teaches wherein the annotation is stored as originally drawn as additional context information in association with the image file (Dawe, col. 7 lines 9-11, 18-20 and 57-65).

Response to Arguments

18. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 10, 11, 15, 17, 18, 20-22, 24-28, 30 and 31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

19. Applicant's arguments filed March 3, 2010, regarding claim 28, have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

20. Regarding claim 28, Applicant argues that Dawe fails to teach determining if the bounded character or word lies within the selected on screen region. Examiner disagrees. As explained in the claim objection above, claim 28 requires the bounded character or word to be included in the on-screen region, thus it is already determined that such is true. Further, Dawe teaches if the region is not determined to be a notation, it is determined whether the region includes any handwriting (col. 7 lines 6-20). This determination step is equivalent to determining if a bounded character or word (i.e. the text "great job") lies within the region.

Conclusion

21. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ALICIA M. LEWIS whose telephone number is (571)272-5599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 - 6:30, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2164

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/A. M. L./
Examiner, Art Unit 2164
June 19, 2010

/Charles Rones/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2164